IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

ELIZABETH MORENO,

Plaintiff,

v. Civ. 16-00027 RB/SCY

AMERICAN CLAIMS MANAGEMENT, et al..

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel. ECF No. 5. Having reviewed the Motion, the Court finds that it should be denied.

"There is no constitutional right to appointed counsel in a civil case. However, '[t]he court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel." *Baker v. Simmons*, 65 Fed. App'x 231, 238 (10th Cir. 2003) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1)) (other citations omitted). "The decision to appoint counsel is left to the sound discretion of the district court." *Engberg v. Wyoming*, 265 F.3d 1109, 1122 (10th Cir. 2001). When deciding whether to grant a litigant's motion, the following factors guide the decision to appoint counsel in a civil case: "the merits of the litigant's claims, the nature of the factual issues raised in the claims, the litigant's ability to present his claims, and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims." *Thomas v. Brockbank*, 195 Fed. App'x 804, 807 (10th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Williams v. Meese*, 926 F. 2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991)). Finally, the "burden is on the applicant to convince the court that there is sufficient merit to h[er] claim to warrant the appointment of counsel." *Hill v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.*, 393 F.3d 1111, 1115 (10th Cir. 2004) (internal quotation omitted).

In considering Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel, the Court has carefully reviewed the Motion, relevant case law, and the pleadings filed in this case in light of the above-referenced factors. After careful consideration of all the circumstances, the Court denies plaintiff's request for *pro bono* counsel. The Court is not convinced that there is sufficient merit to plaintiff's claims to warrant the Court's requesting assistance of counsel. Accordingly, the Court, having reviewed Plaintiff's complaint and other filings in light of the foregoing factors, finds that Plaintiff's motion should be denied.

Wherefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel, (ECF No. 5), is **DENIED**.

Steve Garleng UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE